

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/721,550	REICH, NORBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BJ Forman	1634	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) BJ Forman.

(3) _____.

(2) Claude Nassif.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 July 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

41-48 54 61 63-65 (as numbered in Amendments of 12 March 2004)

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted Mr. Nassif to discuss amendments to the claims because upon review of the allowed claims it was determined, by the examiner, that the specification does not provide support for Claims 41-48, 54, 61 and 63-65. The examiner explained that the reiterative microarray embodiment recited in the above claims is not supported by the methods described in the specification. It was also noted that numerous claims within the claim set filed 12 March 2004 are mis-numbered. The above numbers represent numbering of claims in the amendment of 12 March 2004.

Mr. Nassif disagreed with the examiner's conclusion, but agreed to cancel the claims thereby allowing the remaining claims to proceed to issue. Mr. Nassif stated that the claims are canceled without prejudice and Applicant intends to continue prosecution of the claims in a continuation application. The examiner acknowledges Applicant's disagreement and Applicant's intention to further prosecute the canceled claims in a continuation application.


BJ FORMAN, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER